

the subpoena for Dale Bennett's deposition on November 9, 2016, that Defendant responded to Plaintiff by email, on November 11, 2016, objecting to the deposition. ([Filing No. 35-4](#)).

The court directs the parties to this court's local rules, which provide:

To curtail undue delay in the administration of justice, this court only considers a discovery motion in which the moving party, in the written motion, shows that after personal consultation with opposing parties and sincere attempts to resolve differences, the parties cannot reach an accord. This showing must also state the date, time, and place of the communications and the names of all participating persons.

NECivR [7.1](#)(i). Defendant's own failure to meaningfully confer and its dilatory responses to Plaintiff's scheduling requests put Defendant in this position, requiring the filing of this protective order on the eve of the deposition. The court will deny Defendant's motion. Going forward, the court encourages both parties to meet and confer in accordance with this court's rules to resolve further discovery disputes and scheduling issues. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED: Defendant's Motion for Protective Order *Instanter* ([Filing No. 32](#)) is denied.

DATED: November 14, 2016.

BY THE COURT:

s/ F.A. Gossett
United States Magistrate Judge